

US Statement on July 30 Draft
Post-2015 Intergovernmental Negotiations
As Delivered by Tony Pipa, US Special Coordinator for the Post-2015
Development Agenda
July 30, 2015

Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitator. We thank you and your teams once again for your persistent and unrelenting hard work – to listen to the full content of our statements this week and to turn around a new draft so soon after. You have accepted an enormous challenge here, on our behalf, and we truly thank you for it.

We look forward to continuing to engage with member states to find solutions that move us to consensus yet would be remiss if we did not speak directly to our concern about the state of this document at this very late stage. We spoke on Monday about the dilution of the central vision and mission in the last version. We all know well that for our task here – and the grand ambitions we all have for it – to succeed, we must unite around a clear and common purpose, **a clear understanding of what we are collectively for.**

A suite of late additions – even within this new text - speak to a range of fine-grained national interests and demands, as well as divisive political issues. We would suggest now that it is our job – collectively - as the arbiters of this final text to rise above this. To find the discipline to tighten and streamline our document far further. To take it in the opposite direction. And in so doing, to prove to all that an inclusive, transparent, member state-developed process will move us to the greatest heights. We are prepared to work with all member states to find solutions that are constructive that take our outcome to such a place.

We have a model already for the very streamlining and tightening that we recommend here – in the form of the new “alternative” **Preamble**. We find this to be compelling. A tool for both communicating our broader messaging and for driving action.

We note as well, with appreciation, that you have taken the “Introduction” and the “Our Vision” sections and returned them to the concise and punchy form of their previous version. Paired with the Preamble, these changes

ensure that the very front of our Declaration is meaningful to all readers. We thank you for this excellent counterpoint to the sections that follow.

I will run through our suggestions to the text, but want to note at the outset our concerns with the text in Chapter 3, the Means of Implementation. On the whole, this text is the precise reason that we have argued for further clarity about the relationship between the Addis outcome and our means of implementation. The selectively chosen snippets from Addis open us up to an immediate renegotiation of an outcome and consensus on which we just completed eight months of work. This is unacceptable and makes us concerned that it will require significant time to work this out.

We will now turn to the exact text. As I mentioned, we find the new, streamlined preamble more compelling and communicative. We support this version and we strongly agree with the suggestion from AOSIS about using the first paragraph from the original preamble as a stronger jump start to the document. It hits the right notes and is a convincing opening.

INTRODUCTION

In Paragraph 3, as we have noted before, we see the last sentence as inappropriate, as it suggests that countries would be excused from protecting human rights and promoting gender equality, depending on their level of development and capacity. We call for deleting that sentence.

In Paragraph 7,

- We note that the language on human rights related to water has been somewhat contentious and very carefully negotiated in the UNGA and the UNHRC over the past several years. That carefully negotiated language does not include affordability.
- We support target 6.1 (“achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all”) as very laudable policy goal, but we cannot in the context of post-2015 confuse that policy goal with a human right.
- At the same time, we have heard the calls for the political declaration to recognize human rights related to water, and we have been working hard with our human rights experts to try to accommodate those concerns.
- UNGA and UNHRC resolutions have acknowledged that the right to safe drinking water and sanitation is derived from the right to an

adequate standard of living contained in the ICESR, **for parties to that instrument**. We have also recognized that there are other human rights obligations and commitments related to safe drinking water, including for example non-discrimination obligations. As a result, we are prepared to work closely with other delegations to find a formulation that would work for all of us. Starting from the current text, we could support it with several key edits so that it would read as follows: “A world where human rights related to safe drinking water are promoted.”

We would be happy to work with other delegations to ensure that we arrive at language that would be acceptable to all.

- In paragraph 9, we suggest the addition of language directly from Rio + 20: "And one in which democracy, good governance and the rule of law, at the national and international levels, as well as an enabling environment, are essential for sustainable development, including sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development, environmental protection and the eradication of poverty and hunger." This is an important addition to round out this paragraph.
- In Paragraph 10, we continue to call for the deletion of the phrase “such as the Declaration on the Right to Development.” Again, we find it inappropriate to include a reference to the Declaration on the Right to Development – which is a nonbinding and non-consensus document - in a section on shared principles alongside the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. We also note that the reference to the Millennium Declaration has been moved out of this paragraph and call for its reintegration there. We also call for the deletion of the right to development in Paragraph 34.
- In Paragraph 20, we suggest deletion of “all internationally recognized” in front of human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- On Paragraph 12, our position is well known – we do not support singling out principle 7 above all other Rio Principles, as many Rio principles are relevant to this sustainable development agenda.

- In Paragraph 29, we would call for the last sentence to be deleted, or, in the alternative, for this sentence to be moved up and merged with the second sentence, so it's clear that part of our collaborative contribution to changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns includes the mobilization, from all sources, of financing and technical assistance. We would also ask that the sentence beginning "We encourage" and the sentence beginning "All countries" be merged to better mirror target 12.1, so it would read "We encourage the implementation of the 10-Year Framework of Programs on SCP, all countries taking action.. and so forth."
- We continue to call for the deletion of Paragraph 30, as we have noted previously.
- Between the two alternatives of paragraphs 31 and 31 alt, like others we would prefer to work from 31 alt. If we can agree that is the case, as we have all agreed in this room, the UNFCCC is the primary forum for negotiating the global response to climate change. As a result, the final sentence should factually recall the Lima outcome document, and restate it precisely, as we did in paragraph 59 of the FFD outcome text. The exact text:
- We recall the Lima call for climate action and we are encouraged by the commitment of the Conference of the Parties to reaching an ambitious agreement in Paris in 2015 that is applicable to all parties and that reflects the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances.
- With respect to CBDR, like the EU and others, we do not support singling out this principle generally. However, if we are going to reference it in this Agenda at all, for the sake of consensus, we could accept this reference in paragraph 31 alt, so long as it reflects precisely what was agreed by UNFCCC parties in Lima.
- In Paragraph 33, while we support the Habitat conference and look forward to a strong engagement there, we suggest that its inclusion in a document that charts our course for the next 15 years is an example

of the type of additions that risk dilution of the visionary focus of our declaration.

- In Paragraph 36, we call for the re-insertion of the phrase “and shared responsibility” after ‘global citizenship,’ as shared responsibility is a fundamental principle of this universal agenda.
- We still think the section on MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION in the Introduction is unnecessary. Although shorter, which is positive, it is still redundant and inconsistent with language we just agreed in Addis, and which we have all agreed not to re-litigate here in post-2015.
- In Paragraph 38 we cannot accept the phrase “and a wide range of other supportive policies and measures on favourable terms, including preferential terms for developing countries” and call for its deletion.
- In Paragraph 39, we suggest changing the phrase in the third line about “people in vulnerable situations” to “the most vulnerable”, as this is broader and more reflective of our focus on the poor and vulnerable. We also note and question the inclusion of new language in the second half of this paragraph on Parliaments, as we don’t recall that suggestion being shared previously in the room.
- We were surprised to see and strongly disagree with the addition of the first line in Paragraph 40 suggesting that the targets under Goal 17 and the other MOI targets to be at the core of the agenda, suggesting they are more important than the other goals and targets in our agenda. Indeed, we understand the eradication of extreme poverty to be at the core of our new agenda. Making goal 17 and the means of implementation superior to the other 16 goals undermines the integrated nature of our goals and targets.
- Overall we do not believe this paragraph 40 captures the interconnection between Addis and the SDGs correctly, and as our LDC colleague just asked, we must ensure policy coherence between Addis and Post-2015. We would propose:

- “The means of implementation targets, which are an integral part of the Sustainable Development Goals and targets, were incorporated into and elaborated upon in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda as the outcome document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Addis Ababa from 13-16 July 2015. That text, and any direct successor documents, will provide the guiding framework in which these targets should be implemented in order to achieve the post-2015 development agenda.”
- We do not believe Paragraph 41 adds value or is necessary in this particular section and would suggest its deletion – and if we work from it, we suggest that it be made completely consistent with paragraphs 8 and 50 from the Addis Action Agenda.
- In Paragraph 52, we think capacity-building for data collection is addressed thoroughly in paragraph 126 of the Addis outcome document.
- We note the addition of Paragraph 54 and while we don’t see the need for it, if important to other member states, we would suggest its alignment with paragraph 247 from The Future We Want.
- We also have smaller technical edits on several other paragraphs in this section, and will provide those in writing.

GOALS & TARGETS

On goals and targets, we appreciate the work of the co-facilitators and the collective of the member states in integrating and finding consensus on strengthening our targets.

- On target 17.2, as the language comes from Addis, we would suggest making completely consistent by saying “to implement their respective official development assistance commitments.”
- We can accept the other changes that are proposed and find them to strengthen our agenda, and are thankful to delegations for their work on these.
- In addition, we continue to call for a one-word change to targets 2.5 and 15.6, to ensure that they are implementable and do not go beyond current international conventions.

MOI SECTION

- Paragraphs 55 to 71 quote Addis selectively, combining sentences from different Addis paragraphs in ways that upset a keenly discussed and agreed-upon political balance that we agreed to only two weeks ago. **We cannot accept this section as drafted.** If we are to keep it, we have suggestions for extensive changes that we will send you in written form.

FOLLOW UP SECTION

Overall, we find the changes in this section to be sensible and move us in the right direction. Just a few minor comments:

- On Paragraph 74a, we do not agree that there will be only one outcome from the national level processes, but many. We also call for the deletion of the word “official” in the last line, as many data sources will be necessary to track progress accurately.
- On Paragraph 74h, this topic is also covered by Addis paragraph 126.
- On Paragraph 82, we do not want to lose the important idea of a network of review processes with the HLPF at its apex. We would prefer the previous sentence in that regard. If we work from this new formula, we propose for the first sentence to say, “The HLPF **oversee a network** of follow-up and review **processes** at the global level...”

Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitator. We look forward to working with other member states on solutions to these issues and moving to consensus